## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

LAMARR ROWELL,

Petitioner,

VS.

JACK PALMER, et al.,

Respondents.

Case No. 3:10-CV-00135-LRH-(VPC)

## **ORDER**

Before the court are the amended petition for writ of habeas corpus (#31), respondents' motion to dismiss (#36), petitioner's response to motion to dismiss (#41), and petitioner's motion for dismissal of grounds two(B), two(C), and two(D) (#42).

The amended petition originally contained five numbered grounds. The court dismissed grounds 1, 3, 4, and 5, and the court directed respondents to respond to the remaining ground 2, which itself has four parts. Order (#35).

The parties agree that petitioner has not exhausted his available remedies in state court for grounds two(B), two(C), and two(D) of the amended petition (#31). Petitioner asks the court to dismiss those grounds. Even though the briefing schedules for the motions have not expired, further briefing is not necessary under these circumstances.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that respondents' motion to dismiss (#36) and petitioner's motion for dismissal of grounds two(B), two(C), and two(D) (#42) are **GRANTED**. Grounds two(B), two(C), and two(D) are **DISMISSED** for failure to exhaust available state-court remedies.

## Case 3:10-cv-00135-LRH-VPC Document 43 Filed 10/05/11 Page 2 of 2

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondents shall have forty-five (45) days from the date of entry of this order to file and serve an answer, which shall comply with Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts. Petitioner shall have forty-five (45) days from the date on which the answer is served to file a reply. DATED this 5th day of October, 2011. Elsihe LARRY R. HICKS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE